

Interview Summary	Application No. 09/755,071	Applicant(s) AHN ET AL.	
	Examiner George C. Eckert II	Art Unit 2815	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) George C. Eckert II.

(3) Rupa Chilukuri.

(2) Gabriela Coman.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 25 June 2004.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: All.

Identification of prior art discussed: Anand and Min.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Ms. Coman presented arguments that the references were not combinable as Anand was not concerned with the Ti-Si-N barrier layer in its damascene structure. As such, because Min was drawn to an improved Ti-Si-N layer, the references were not combinable because an artisan would not be motivated by Min to improve the barrier taught by Anand. The examiner did not agree because Anand teaches the instant claim but for the specific method of Ti-Si-N deposition, while Min teaches the method and provides motivation for its use. As such, the rejection is maintained.